

REMARKS

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the above referenced application is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Applicant has removed the wording “in combination”, and thus this rejection is believed to be overcome.

The specification stands objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(d). Applicant respectfully notes that the first connector may be identified as connector 40, 42, 44 and 46, each having a first interface comprising profile 34 including pins 36. The second connector may be identified as connector 100 in Figures 14-23, with the second connector being identified as reference 22 having pins 18 and a third interface 110 adapted to connect to a portable electronic device to be powered (see specification page 17 lines 14- page 19, line 14). Accordingly, this objection is believed to be overcome.

Claims 1-4, 6, and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Rupert U.S. Patent 6,540,549. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rupert in view of Schroeder U.S. Patent 4,405,190. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rupert.

Applicant has reviewed Rupert and provides the following distinctions between the limitations of independent Claims 1 and 8 in view of this reference.

Generally, Rupert is directed to an electrical power distribution system for sequentially distributing power between work stations by way of jumpers. The solution is to impose a limit on the number and/or the sequence in which the work stations are concatenated. (See specification column 1, lines 20-33). One advantage of this solution is that the sequence in which a number of work stations can be chained together by interconnecting jumpers is strictly determined by keyed work station and jumper connection configurations. (See column 2, lines 8-12). Various connectors having different matching keyed arrangements are disclosed so that only some connectors can mate with other connectors. Thus, for example, if the maximum number of permissible power taps in a single circuit is eight, the chain can only be extended to a

maximum of eight power taps. If the maximum number of power taps is five, a maximum of five power taps can be established in the chain. (See specification column 3, lines 37-42). With emphasis, each of the connectors is not configured, nor do they have a profile, as a function of its power rating. Rather, the keying effects the order in which work stations can be chained is provided. To limit how the chain can be interconnected, a manufacturer simply fails to even supply a certain power tap with a particular one of the nine possible configurations and the system is thereby limited to no more than eight stations. (See specification column 4, lines 12-13). Thus, the particular “puzzle pieces” that are provided by the manufacturer determines how the puzzle can be put together. Each connector of the chain, however, can pass whatever power is drawn by the load. There is no teaching or suggestion that any of the connectors has a shape or keying arrangement that is commensurate with any particular load that may try to draw power therethrough. For instance, one load could actually draw all power allowed by the power source, such that if any of the other seven connectors were used to draw more power, a circuit breaker at the source may be triggered.

Independent Claim 1 in contrast, recites that the device connector is rated at a predetermined power rating, and with emphasis, “having a profile being a function of the device connector power rating”. This limitation distinguishes the claimed invention from Rupert, as the profile of the connectors in Rupert ‘549 are not a function of the device connector power rating. Rather, the profile of the connectors in Rupert ‘549 are simply puzzle pieces limiting how a chain of connectors can be interconnected. There is absolutely no teaching nor suggestion of the power rating of the connectors themselves, rather, only the number of units allowed to receive the source per an electrical code, such as the NEMA electrical code requirement. (See column 4, lines 7-10).

Still referring to independent Claim 1, an additional distinction is that the second interface of the body is adapted to couple to a “portable electronic device”. Referring to Applicant’s specification, portable electronic devices are defined to encompass consumer electronic devices, such as cellular telephones, PDA’s, SmartPhones, Digital Cameras, and portable DVD players. In contrast, the devices powered by the chain of connectors in Rupert are work stations, such as a lamp. Thus, Rupert does not teach a body having a second interface

adapted to couple to a portable electronic device as recited.

Referring to dependent Claim 3, is it further recited that the device connector power rating is commensurate with a power rating of a portable electronic device adapted to be coupled thereto. Support for the limitation is found in Applicant's specification on page 15, line 22 – page 17, line 13. As previously discussed, there is no teaching in Rupert of power rating matching between a connector and a device to be powered, but rather, only how the chain can be established. Dependent Claim 6 also recites limitations neither taught nor suggested by Rupert. The claimed key portion is recited as being adapted to interfere with a power source connector that is "power rated below the device connector power rating". Again, Rupert fails to teach or suggest such limitations.

Referring now to independent Claim 8, there is recited both a first connector and a second connector including some limitations included in independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the above comments and distinctions apply to independent Claim 8 as well.

It is respectfully submitted that all pending Claims 1-12 are allowable over the cited prior art, and a notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any other matters which remain, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve these matters by Examiner's amendment where possible.

A check in the amount of \$450.00 for the Two Month Extension of Time is enclosed, and the Examiner is authorized to debit deposit account 50-1752 if any additional fees are required.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert C. Klinger
Reg. No. 34,365
Attorney for Applicant

Jackson Walker L.L.P.
2435 North Central Expressway, Suite 600
Richardson, Texas 75080
(972) 744-2902 (972) 238-3302 – Fax